



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but I consider that it is quite consonant with the religious feelings of those who believe that God has displayed extraordinary manifestations of his power in particular places, to visit such places, and pay to God there the tribute of their devotion; but not to pay it to images on any account, even though they stepped down from their pedestals and walked.

SIDRACH.

The remarks which we made in the November number of our journal (page 122), as well as our observations on the former letter of "Sidrach," have already put our readers in possession of our views on the important subjects which he discusses; and we do not deem it necessary to repeat them now. We have only space to make one or two brief observations on the new topics which "Sidrach" has introduced in his present communication.

He says that we have "fallen into a grave error in not distinguishing between articles of faith, in which all [Roman] Catholics must believe, and scholastic opinions or private considerations." This charge must have been advanced through inadvertence; inasmuch as, in all our discussions of the points of difference between the two churches, we have studiously endeavoured to guard ourselves against the very error which "Sidrach" condemns. Let him turn, for example, to the article on "Auricular Confession" in our present number, and he will find that in this, as in all other instances, we have been careful, not only to assign a prominent place to the decrees of the Council of Trent, but even to quote their exact words. If "Sidrach" will refer us to any other more authoritative exposition of the creed of the Church of Rome, we shall readily bring it forward. In the course of our arguments, indeed, it is sometimes difficult for us to avoid noticing "private" or "scholastic" opinions. Roman Catholic controversialists are so fond of insisting on the unity of their own Church, and the divisions of Protestants, that we have occasionally felt it necessary to prove that the Church of Rome has, from time to time, been rent asunder by as deep dissensions as any which can be alleged against other branches of the Catholic Church; but we have ever been careful to avoid the error of imputing the extreme opinions of individuals to the whole Roman Catholic body.

"Sidrach" goes on to state, that "the respect for images is no article of faith, but a pious practice recommended by the Church." This assertion of our correspondent surprised us not a little. We opened the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv.), which, after reciting that "due honour and veneration is to be paid to the images of Christ, the Virgin, and other saints," in the next paragraph adds the significant words—"If any person shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be accused." (Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit aut senserit, anathema sit.) Is the Church of Rome wont to recommend her pious practices to her people under the dread alternative of an anathema? We always believed that this terrible sentence was reserved for those obstinate heretics who rejected articles of faith. Yet here we see, that it is denounced against all who even think that "due honour and veneration" (whatever that may mean) is not to be paid to the images of the saints. Either, therefore, image worship is an article of faith, or else the Church of Rome is more uncharitable than our correspondent would willingly have her thought.

The next plea urged by "Sidrach" on behalf of this practice is, that it prevailed from the earliest period; and in proof of this he adduces some passages from Tertullian, Eusebius, and other writers. It is a dangerous thing to quote isolated allusions from ancient authors in support of opinions which they would be the first to condemn. We are sure, that if our correspondent had ever read the following extract from Tertullian, he would scarcely have relied upon his authority in support of image worship. "When the devil," says Tertullian (de Idol. p. 86, Par. 1675), "introduced into the world manufacturers of statues, and images, and representations of every description, that rude trafficking of human calamity derived both its name and its profit from idols. Hence every act which produces an idol, in whatsoever manner, becomes the head of idolatry. . . . Consequently, every form or diminutive image must be called an idol. . . . Wherefore, to eradicate the very basis of idolatry, the divine law proclaims; 'ye shall not make an idol;' and it forthwith subjoins; 'nor the likeness of the things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, and which are in the sea.'"

We invite the attention of our readers to this remarkable passage. Not only does Tertullian interpret the second commandment literally, as we have done—in accordance with the great body of English Divines, and against the decrees of the Council of Trent—but he goes much further, and does not hesitate to assert, that the devil was the author of the arts of statuary and painting. This very exaggeration adds to the value of his testimony against the prevalence of image worship in his day; for he never would have used such strong language in condemnation of these arts, if the Christians, in his time, notoriously venerated images. If "Sidrach," instead of relying on the authority of Bishop Milner, had taken the trouble

to refer to the passage of Tertullian which he cites, he would have seen what little support it lends him. (The words are these (p. 563.), "cui si ille forte patrocinabitur pastor, quem in calice depingis . . . de quo nihil libentius bibas, quam ovem penitentiae secundae.") The allusion to the sheep renders it probable, that the cup referred to by Tertullian represented a scene from our Lord's well-known parable, not a personal likeness of the Saviour; but even granting that the latter is his meaning in this passage, which must be admitted to be very obscure, Tertullian does not assert that this was a prevalent custom in the Church; nor does he give the least hint that any special reverence or veneration was paid to this figure; on the contrary, he plainly intimates his disapproval of such representations, by adding the words, "Ast ego ejus pastoris Scripturas haurio, qui non potest frangi." "I," saith he, "imbibe the Scriptural representations of that Shepherd, who cannot be broken"—i.e., the history of Christ in his holy Word, the superiority of which Tertullian contrasts with frail, perishable memorials of wood or metal. To this picture of our Lord—a picture drawn by the pencil of the inspired Evangelists—we would earnestly invite the attention of "Sidrach," and of our other Roman Catholic readers. It is one which they cannot study too often, or prize too highly.

Eusebius is "Sidrach's" next authority, which he borrows, like the former, from Bishop Milner, who, as usual, overstates, or rather misrepresents the meaning of the original. Eusebius does not assert that a brazen image of our Saviour was erected by the woman whom he cured. He saw a brazen statue, indeed; but he takes care not to pledge himself to the truth of the story, for he twice uses the cautious phrase "they say" (ἐλεγον). Eusebius, as is well known, lived about three hundred years after our Lord, in which period many false stories and legends would naturally arise. He further adds, at the end of the chapter, a pretty severe condemnation of this practice of erecting statues, which he traces back to the times of heathen superstition. "It is probable enough," he says, "that those ancients, according to the custom of the heathens, were wont, *unadvisedly*, to honour all those after this manner as saviours, by whom they have been in any ways benefitted." The Greek word is ἀπαρφυλάκτως, which Valesius (the eminent Roman Catholic editor of Eusebius) translates "inconsiderate et imprudenter, contra veterem disciplinam,"—i.e., inconsiderately, unadvisedly, contrary to the doctrine of the ancients. So much for the testimony of Eusebius.

We cannot now discuss the other passages cited by "Sidrach," from Bishop Milner, but we hope, on some future opportunity, to return to this subject. Meanwhile, we would request our correspondent (whose good temper and moderation we gladly acknowledge) to read the original authorities himself; and, unless we are greatly mistaken, he will see much reason to distrust his clever and plausible, but very unsafe guide.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—You will excuse the presumption of a layman if I protest against your tacit acquiescence in the view incidentally put by "Catholicus," of the question of Transubstantiation. I cannot believe it to be a question of figurative or literal interpretation of our Lord's words on the institution of the Eucharist. I deny that Roman Catholics interpret them as literally as Protestants, or that Protestants resort to as many figurative interpretations as Roman Catholics. To rest so momentous a question on any delusion of words is most dangerous. Misplaced epithets generate false ideas.

Both sides are too apt to think that the whole question in dispute turns on the "material" instead of the "spiritual" presence of our Lord's body and blood. The Roman Catholic controversialist thinks he has proved all when he advances his arguments in favour of the material presence. To me it appears that all that is worth disputing in his faith yet remains unproved. I am firmly convinced that the material presence is a mistaken view; but yet it appears to me a mere matter of abstract theory, not directly influencing practice or involving religious guilt.

The dead body of our Saviour, deprived of his "soul and Divinity" (the mere flesh), was not worshipped when laid in the tomb⁽¹⁾, nor the blood that flowed from his wounds on Calvary. Were a portion of one substituted miraculously for the consecrated wafer, and of the other to fill the chalice in place of the wine, it would, indeed, literally and exactly fulfil the words of the text, but it would form no grounds for believing that either or both of them were the actual Deity incarnate. We may believe the bread to be his body, without perilling our souls upon our judgment; but we cannot offer the adoration that is due to God alone to the consecrated bread, without a tremendous risk.

This is the important point that controversialists usually omit. What exact name should be given to such an act of adoration, assuming it to be founded in

error, I do not pretend to say. It may not, perhaps, be actual idolatry, for it is offered under the conception that the Deity himself is its object; but it certainly very nearly approaches it, and must, at least, involve an awful responsibility. The commands to worship none but God himself, "in spirit and in truth"—no material emblem of him—are plain and peremptory. We need commands as express to justify our adoration of aught in apparent violation of these. The onus is thrown on those who make an exception to a plain precept, to show that they do not bow down before senseless matter.

Bearing this in mind as the most momentous point in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, let us see whether the "literal" meaning of the words will justify such a dogma of the Divine and adorable presence, or whether the Roman Catholic doctrine be not only figurative, but even imaginative.

Let us take the words of institution in St. Matthew⁽²⁾, as well as the explanatory version in the Corinthians, and then place after the text the authoritative definitions condensed from the Council of Trent⁽³⁾.

St. Matthew says—"As they were eating," &c.

Council of Trent—"It must not be after eating, but after fasting."

St. Matthew—"Take, eat," &c.

Council of Trent—"Not only eat this, but *adore* it as the Deity, and offer it as the same *sacrifice* that was offered by our Saviour on the cross."

St. Matthew—"Drink ye all of it," &c.

Council of Trent—"Do not *ALL* drink of it; let only the few who are ecclesiastics drink of it."

St. Matthew—"This is my body," &c.

Council of Trent—"This is not my body, but my body *AND* blood, my soul and Divinity—the Deity."

St. Matthew—"This is my blood of the New Testament," &c.; and St. Paul and St. Luke—"This is the New Testament in my blood," &c.⁽⁴⁾

Council of Trent—"This is not my blood, nor is it the New Testament; but it is my blood *AND* body, my soul and Divinity—the Deity."

St. Matthew says—"I will not drink of this fruit of the vine," &c.

Council of Trent—"The fruit of the vine of which I speak is *NOT* the fruit of the vine; but is this Jesus Christ, who hold it in my hand, and say, *I will not drink of it till*," &c.

St. Paul says—"Is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"⁽⁵⁾

Council of Trent—"Is it not the body itself, and *not* our communion of (*κοινωνία*)—participation in—the body?"

N.B.—The sacrifice, or victim, and our participation in it, or its benefits, are two very distinct matters.

St. Paul says—"My body which is broken," &c.⁽⁶⁾

The Council of Trent says—"This is not that which Christ 'brake'—it is not *το κλωμενον*—not that which is, but that which *shall* be broken"⁽⁷⁾.

St. Paul and St. Luke say—"Do this in remembrance of me."

Council of Trent—"Do not do this in remembrance of him who 'sits for ever at God's right hand,' but in his actual presence, with human body and incorporated Divinity."

St. Paul says—"For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread"⁽⁸⁾.

Council of Trent—"Neither of the breads here spoken of are literal, neither of them means bread, and both figurative meanings are different."

St. Paul says—"This bread," &c.;⁽⁹⁾ but the Council of Trent says—"This bread, referred to thrice by the Apostle, after its consecration, does not, any one of the three times, mean *LITERAL* bread."

St. Paul says—"Not discerning the Lord's body."

The Council of Trent says—"This is spoken of the unworthy; but it is only figurative, as neither worthy nor unworthy do literally *discern*⁽¹⁰⁾ the Lord's body, which, though there, can never be discerned."

I trust, sir, that till "Catholicus" can explain these vital discrepancies we shall hear no more of the Roman Catholic being the *literal* interpretation! Whether it be the *natural* one is another matter—that we can argue separately; but the vulgar are apt to assume, that however that part of the argument might lean to the Protestant views, the letter of the text is with Roman Catholics. I cannot see any foundation for such a prejudice.

But for the space I have already occupied I should proceed to show that the Protestant interpretation flows

(2) xxvi. 26.

(3) I need hardly say, that the words themselves are not here copied, but what appears to be their short effect, as given in the Council, and as developed in the Catechism.

(4) 1 Cor. xi. 25. Luke xxii. 20.

(5) 1 Cor. x. 16.

(6) 1 Cor. xi. 24.

(7) This change of tense is made because it is supposed to identify the Eucharist with Christ's actual body that should be broken on the cross. It is curious that it was not observed that it would have just the opposite effect. Christ's body was *not* broken on the cross; and some stress is laid on the fact by St. John, xix., 33—"They brake not his legs," and v. 36—"That the Scripture might be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken."

(8) 1 Cor. x. 16.

(9) 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28.

(10) Whatever different translations may be given to this word, it cannot be literally understood by Roman Catholics.

(1) We find Mary Magdalene sitting at the sepulchre (Mat. xxvii. 61), but *worshipping* Him on his appearance after the resurrection (xxviii. 9.)

from the words—*ex vi terminorum*: so that it is not fair to represent it as figurative. The word "is" has not been used simply for "represent;" the latter would not convey the whole meaning, nor could our views have been expressed—consistently with the Jewish notions of the times—in any other words but those which inspiration has here employed.

In the sacrifice of the Passover the one victim was slain for the entire household; none participated in its benefits who did not partake of the flesh; to eat it was the mark of those who joined in it. The passage in the sixth chapter of St. John, does not refer to the Eucharist; but as both passages relate to the offering up of our Lord's body and blood upon the cross, both have parallel expressions of harmonious import. Except we eat of the great victim, except we participate in the great atoning sacrifice, we have no life. In this sense the Eucharist is—not represents—what St. Paul declares it to be, our "participation in the body and blood of Christ" (1st). But this branch of my argument cannot be more than suggested, without trenching unreasonably on your space.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

ON AURICULAR CONFESSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having read, in your February number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, what you have quoted from the "Touchstone," and your reply concerning private confession, you appear to me to think that no such practice existed in the Apostolic age; and I believe, from what I have seen of your research, that you are a competent person to tell when and where the practice begun, &c.

I, though a member of the Roman Catholic Church, would be anxious to ascertain the truth, and would, therefore, feel greatly pleased and truly thankful if you would give your readers a historical specimen of the whole matter.

I have seen a statement made in a catechism, written by the Rev. E. Norman, Rector of Brosna, relative to Auricular Confession, which is as follows:—

"Q. When was auricular or whispering confession introduced?

"A. In the year 1215, at the fourth Lateran Council it was commanded as an ecclesiastical constitution, but not made necessary to salvation till the Council of Trent, about 1546."

But I am of the opinion that it was in existence long before that; for I remember to have read in a Protestant author—Bishop Burnet's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 363—as follows:—"Penitents were enjoined to publish such of their secret sins as the penitentiary priest did prescribe. This happened to give great scandal at Constantinople, when Nectarius was bishop there, in the fourth century."

Again, I have read, from Bishop Challoner's "Catholic Christian Instructed," p. 99, edition 13, Dublin. Speaking of Confession, he says—"We conclude with St. Augustine, that to pretend it is enough to confess to God alone, is making void the power of the keys given to the Church," &c. In proof of this, a reference is made to Homil. 49, into alios. 50.

From these testimonies I have some reason to believe that private confession is of very early standing, &c.

I sincerely hope you will do me the kindness of inserting these few lines, &c.

I am, &c., yours truly,

A NORTHERN READER.

[Our correspondent will perceive that we have commenced the subject of confession in our present number, but have been obliged to postpone the historical part of it till our next, in which we hope to give him the information he very reasonably requires.—ED.]

ON JAMES V. 14, 15.

SIR—Permit me to express a different opinion from you on the interpretation of the text—James v. 14, 15—given in a paper headed the "Touchstone," in the February No. of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, page 20, objection 36.

I shall first quote the text in full, then quote the interpretation you have given, next advance reasons which compel me to dissent from this, and afterwards propose a paraphrase expressing my own view.

"Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

The interpretation given is—"The gift of miraculously healing the sick, which is evidently what the Apostle is speaking of."

The following are some of my objections to this interpretation:—

1. It does not appear to me that gifts of healing were ever possessed generally by the Church to the extent which this interpretation supposes. It would imply that in every congregation, in every possible illness, of every individual, a miracle might be expected. The Apostles themselves do not appear to have possessed

this power (2 Tim. iv. 20), where the Apostle Paul says he left Trophimus sick at Miletus.

2. It appears strange that if such a power existed in any individuals of each congregation that it should be necessary to tell them to apply for the exercise of such a gift. The people themselves must know it, and would be ready enough to use it.

3. It would appear from 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30 and from ecclesiastical history (if dependence can be placed on it in this respect), that the gift of healing did not always reside in the ministers of the Church; but that laymen, and even women, possessed this power. It seems strange that these should not be alluded to.

4. The constant use of prayer, as the means of working the miracles spoken of, seems contrary to the general manner of God's dealing in this matter. The majority of miracles appear to have been suggested by Divine impulse. See among other places Acts xiv. 8; the use of prayer seems the exception.

5. The same argument may be applied to the use of oil. There is no instance after the ascension where oil was used.

6. The precept under consideration comes in among a number of precepts obligatory on the Church to the present day. It seems strange that one precept, the use of which was very shortly to cease, should be introduced among them.

These reasons render it impossible for me to receive the interpretation proposed in the LAYMAN, though it corresponds with that proposed by all the interpreters I can recollect, including Poole, who, however, hints another.

I, therefore, venture to suggest another—premising that though the style of St. James is very abrupt, and the transitions from one subject to another very rapid; yet that frequently we are able to discover a connection, or at least imagine the connection, in the mind of the Apostle. In this respect the Epistle is similar to the Book of Ecclesiastes. The connecting link in the mind of the Apostle in this case appears to be—"Let a spirit of true religion, or a recollection of God as the providential ruler of the world, influence you under all dispensations." (I commence the paraphrase at verse 13.)—"Therefore) is any afflicted (in mind or estate) let him pray (to the author of the affliction). Is any (prosperous, and therefore inclined to be) merry? let him sing psalms (and thus acknowledge God as the Author of his prosperity). Is any sick among you (and therefore more especially under the hand of God, let him acknowledge God more especially, and to do this) let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over (for*) him, (making use of the best means of cure, such as) anointing him with oil, (not with Jewish incantations, but) in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall (frequently) save the sick, and the Lord (by his blessing on the means used, or providential circumstance) shall raise him up; and if (the sickness has been sent, not merely as a trial of his faith, but because) he has committed (some particular) sins (1 Cor. xi. 30), they shall be forgiven him, (and his being raised up when this event does take place may be accepted as an evidence of God's forgiveness)."

The above paraphrase is somewhat long, but I have made it so in order to leave no doubt as to the meaning I endeavour to convey. I was anxious, also, to use every word of the Authorized Version, and I have only in this respect made the alteration of the subjunctive into the indicative mood. I don't think it at all necessary to suppose that the elders were the persons who anointed, though the construction might seem to imply that. That might be the act of any individual connected with the sick man. Prayer was the especial duty of the elders.

If you cannot adopt this interpretation I hope you will at least excuse my sending it to you. This is the explanation I always give my own congregation, and I generally follow it up by some observations on the propriety of sending for a clergyman in case of illness, and not waiting till the last moment.

Yours, &c.,

J. M.

We freely lay the foregoing before our readers, and think it well deserving of attention. The passage cannot be deemed free from difficulty, and the most clear thing in it is, that it does not refer to *Extreme Unction*, as contended for by the author of the Touchstone, for the simple reason we have already given, p. 20. Roman Catholic priests administer *Extreme Unction* without any hope of being able to "raise up" the sick man; and, indeed, only when they believe him to be past recovery.—ED.

ON LADY DAY AND GOOD FRIDAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I'm entirely astray about Lady-day. I'm a poor man that doesn't know much, but I gets your newspaper (thanks be to them that sends it to me), and maybe you would ease my mind, for sure you know more about our religion than I do. Your honour knows that Lady-day always comes on the 25th of March, and it's the greatest holiday we have at all; there's nothing

a man can do worse nor to work upon it. Stealing is nothing to it; why, its worse even than eating meat on a Friday.

Well, your honour, Good Friday is no day with us at all; we never were asked to go to mass, and we may work, or amuse ourselves, or do any idling the boys please.

Well, they say it's the day that our Blessed Saviour was crucified for us; and, indeed, many's the time it seemed strange to me, that we wouldn't be asked to say our prayers that day. But now it seems worse entirely; for this year Lady-day and Good Friday come on us altogether, just on the one day; and it's the great day for religion and mass, is Lady-day; and it comes about, that just because it's the day that our Saviour died for us there's no mass nor prayers at all, not on Lady-day itself. For sure we had no mass, and everybody was labouring or diverting themselves this Lady-day, just as if it was a common day; and a farmer beside me, that's cousin to the priest, had all the men in this side of the country setting his praties, just as if it wasn't Lady-day at all; and that's just what he would be read out in chapel for doing any other Lady-day that ever come. And all because it's the same day, too, that our Saviour died for our sins! Well, now I want to know, when the Blessed Virgin was standing by the cross and watching him at his death, didn't she pray at all? And would she tell us that we musn't pray on that day? And the blessed Apostles, and the holy women that was looking on, didn't they pray? And why wouldn't we pray on that day now? Why, if Lady-day was ever so good a day for religion, how could it be spoiled entirely by being the same day that Jesus Christ died for our sins? and why would we have no religion at all on that day more nor any other day?

Your honour's obedient servant,

PETER BRANNIGAN of Meath.

We have heard of this strange fact already, but we are rather at a loss to explain it or account for it. We do not suppose that the priests wish to prevent people from praying on Good Friday; but why do they refuse them public service just because it is Good Friday? We have just heard that there is a rule that they may not celebrate mass on Good Friday—a very strange rule, if true. We would be glad if any of our readers could tell us if there be such a rule, and, if so, if they could give us any authorities to show how old this rule is.

But even if there can be no mass, why should there not be public prayers on such a day? But we forgot—the prayers are in Latin, and the priests may think that when there is no mass, it can hardly be worth while to bring the people to the prayers that they cannot understand. Alas! for the ancient Church!

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR APRIL.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

FROM the unusually great inclemency of the weather, farming operations of every description have been so much retarded as to increase the labour and render the next few months a time of anxious care and thought to the farmer, and require considerable exertions in pushing on the general routine work, to make up for lost time; at the same time, we would recommend the exercise of the utmost care and caution, and rather do the work well and carefully than do it ill and hurriedly; for though early sowing is much to be encouraged, still it will be better to wait a few days (which may be confidently done) for weather to dry the land sufficiently to enable the harrows to work freely to get in and cover the spring corn, than to do so while the land is wet and poachy; and the same remarks are applicable in the preparation of the land for green crops, which cannot be pulverized as it should be if the land be not sufficiently dry to permit the harrows and grubbers to work freely.

Oats sowing should be proceeded with as the state of the weather and land will be found dry enough. In the poorer class of soils it will be necessary to increase the quantity of seed as the season advances.

Barley.—During this and the beginning of next month is the proper time for sowing spring barley. This species of grain delights in a well-pulverized and sharp, yet rich, soil. Its place in the rotation, like all other grain crops, is after green crops (turnips, &c.) Very often, however, we find the wheat or oat stubble set apart for barley, particularly the former, which in all likelihood, had also followed a grain crop, but matured on the stubble. This is very bad farming, and no one who wishes to keep his land in good order, or to reap the greatest amount of produce which it is capable of producing, will pursue such a practice. When barley is to be sown after potatoes, or such green crops as are raised at the end of the year, the land must receive a winter ploughing, clearing out all the furrows, to prevent water from lodging, and in spring let it be cross-ploughed: after this, harrow and then plough the seed-furrow. This treatment, if the ploughing has been sufficiently deep, will bring the land into a finely-pulverized state, and the crop will be stronger and more equal than if ploughed with only one furrow.

Top-dress wheat and other grain crops and meadow lands with guano, soot, superphosphate of lime, &c., in wet weather, or on the approach of rain.

(1) 1 Cor. x. 16.—*κοινωνία του αμαρτος*.

* *ἐπι* With an accusative admits this meaning.— Luke xxiii. 28.